

DISPATCH		CLASSIFICATION	PROCESSING ACTION
		SECRET	
TO	Chief, KUWOLF (Attn: [])	X	MARKED FOR INDEXING
INFO.	Chief, EE; Chief, CSB/Frankfurt		NO INDEXING REQUIRED
FROM	Chief, Munich Operations Base		ONLY QUALIFIED DESK CAN JUDGE INDEXING
SUBJECT	DTDORIC/PBCHORD/Operations - Transmittal of Memo Regarding Meeting in Yugoslavia		
ACTION REQUIRED - REFERENCES			
Under separate cover is a memorandum concerning a recent U.N.-sponsored meeting in Yugoslavia. As of possible interest to his book program, QRBOUT would appreciate any additional information Headquarters may have, especially with respect to which nationalities were specifically discussed. [] Attachment: USC/TNP Distribution: 2 - KUWOLF (w/atts usc) 1 - EE (w/o att) 1 - CSB/Fran (w/o att)			
DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY SOURCES METHODSEXEMPTION 3028 NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT DATE 2007			
CS COPY			
23 JUL 1965 200-124-39/3			
CROSS REFERENCE TO	DISPATCH SYMBOL AND NUMBER	DATE	
	EGMA-66960	22 July 1965	
	CLASSIFICATION	HQS FILE NUMBER	
	SECRET	200-124-39	

June 25, 1965

- 3 -

RIGHTS OF NATIONAL MINORITIES: SOVIET VIEW SOFTENED? (RN 3417)

(Editor's Note: At a seminar in Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, sponsored by United Nations to discuss rights of national minorities for contact with kindred minorities in other states, the Soviet delegation at first took a hard position against any inherent "right of contact" but suddenly reversed that position at the end of the seminar. In view of the relevance of this important question to Radio Liberty, the report by David Binder about this question which appeared in the New York Times on June 22, 1965, is reproduced here in full.)

Info!
Soviet scholars acknowledged today the rights of association by minorities with in and beyond national frontiers.

It was believed to the first time the Soviet Union, which contains a large number of minority groups, had taken this position. The move came following sharp exchanges on the question at the close of a two-week seminar on multinational societies sponsored by the United Nations. The seminar was attended by unofficial representatives of 19 nations.

Last week, the Russian participants had strongly opposed the argument of the United States representative, Daniel P. Moynihan, that minorities deserved the right of contact across borders with people who shared religious, ethnic, linguistic or other ties.

The Russians also showed resentment at the suggestion of an Israeli participant that the Soviet Union's treatment of Jews was inconsistent with its treatment of its other minorities. But in the last 24 hours they reversed their position. It is understood they also withdrew a draft proposal filled with propaganda about colonialism and racial discrimination in the West.

As a result the seminar was able to reach a consensus on what is generally regarded as one of the most sensitive issues in the world today. One of the outstanding figures at the meeting was Mr. Moynihan, a New Yorker who is assistant Secretary of Labor. His main effort was to persuade the meeting that "there is a special responsibility upon one-party states" to allow minorities "to associate across national borders."

Mr. Moynihan, who has been mentioned as a possible Democratic candidate for Mayor of New York, pointed out that in states where several political parties operate, a minority has the possibility to seek redress for grievances to the support of one or another political parties.

Describing some "rough rules of political relations" he told the seminar that "a government in a multiparty state must be very careful about the enemies it makes" because of possible

No. 2024

June 25, 1965

- 4 -

repercussions with minorities. Most of the participants insisted their own countries had absolutely no minority problems. But Mr. Moyanihan disarmed the participants by recounting the minority problems of the United States with frankness. After he spoke, other participants began to admit they had some problems in their countries, too.

Representatives of the Soviet Union, Ghana, Mali and Czechoslovakia argued that their one-party states were able to care for minorities effectively.

The Indian participant, Purshottam Trikamdas, argued against this point of view, saying that without independent courts and a free press it was impossible for minorities to redress wrongs. (AB)